

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 2, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9-10 are pending in this application, and claim 8 is withdrawn. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 5 are amended and Claims 9 and 10 are added. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found in the specification at, for example, page 17, lines 23- page 18, line 4 and page 18, lines 14-21. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6,777,819); claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Fujimoto (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0006456); claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamada (U.S. Patent No. 6,784,765) in view of Huang; and claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamada and in view of Fujimoto. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a surface-mounted electronic component module that includes a wiring substrate having wiring patterns and external connection terminals, a plurality of electronic component devices, a bonding wire connecting the connection terminal of one of the plurality of electronic component devices with another one of the plurality of electronic component devices, the bonding wire having an inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic of the one electronic component device, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 5.

Huang teaches a semiconductor package with a flash-proof device in which at least one chip and at least one passive device mounted on a substrate are covered by a flash-proof device dimensionally designed for positioning the substrate in a conventional mold and preventing a molding resin from flashing on the substrate in a molding process (Abstract). Moreover, Huang teaches a chip 21 on the substrate 20, the chip 21 being electrically connected to the conductive traces 202 on the substrate 20 via a plurality of gold wires 23 (column 2, lines 59-64). However, Huang fails to disclose or suggest that the bonding wire 23 has a specific inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic of the semi conductor chip 21. In fact, nowhere in Huang is there any teaching of a specific inductance of the gold wires 21. Although the Patent Office argues that the bonding wire inherently possesses an inductance, Huang fails to teach that the gold wires have a specific inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic of the chip 21. Thus, Huang fails to disclose, suggest or render obvious each and every feature on independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1, and its dependent claims, are patentable over Huang.

With respect to their rejection of claim 5, the Patent Office admits that the primary reference, Yamada fails to teach the bonding wire as a predetermined characteristic yielding a specific inductance (Office Action, page 5, lines 15-20). Yamada relies on Huang to disclose or suggest this feature. However, as discussed above, Huang fails to disclose, suggest or render obvious a wire bonding with a specific inductance that eliminates ripples in a frequency band characteristic of the electronic component device. Thus, independent claim 5 and its dependent claims, are patentable over a combination of Huang and Yamada.

Fujimoto teaches a method of manufacturing electronic parts that includes preparing a mother board, mounting element parts on the mother board, providing a thermo setting resin on a surface, semi-curing the resin, splitting the mother board with the resin into individual parts and heating the individual parts so that the resin melts first and is then cured permanently (Abstract). However, Fujimoto fails to cure deficiencies in Huang and Yamada to disclose or suggest the above recited features of independent claims 1 and 5.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 5, and their dependent claims, are patentable over a combination of all the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 108066-00087.

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration Number 55,478

Customer Number 004372
AREN'T FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810